```
09R5freC
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     -----x
 2
 3
     RUBY FREEMAN,
     WANDREA MOSS,
 4
                    Plaintiffs,
                                      New York, N.Y.
5
                                           24 Civ. 6563 (LJL)
                V.
6
     RUDOLPH W. GIULIANI,
 7
                    Defendant.
8
9
                                             September 27, 2024
                                             2:10 p.m.
10
     Before:
11
12
                          HON. LEWIS J. LIMAN,
13
                                             U.S. District Judge
14
15
                               APPEARANCES
16
17
     WILLKIE, FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP
18
          Attorneys for Plaintiffs
     BY: AARON E. NATHAN
19
             -AND-
          PROTECT DEMOCRACY
20
     BY: RACHEL E. GOODMAN
21
22
     KENNETH CARUSO LAW
          Attorney for Defendant
23
     BY: KENNETH A. CARUSO
24
25
```

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conference 1 (Case called) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Starting with counsel for 2 3 plaintiff, please state your appearances for the record. 4 MR. NATHAN: Good morning, your Honor. Good 5 afternoon. Aaron Nathan, Willkie Farr & Gallagher, joined by 6 my colleague Rachel Goodman of Protect Democracy, for the 7 plaintiffs and judgment creditors, Ruby Freeman and Wandrea Shaye Moss. 8 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 10 MR. CARUSO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kenneth 11 Caruso for the defendant, Rudolph W. Giuliani. 12 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, 13 Mr. Caruso. 14 MR. CARUSO: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: As a preliminary matter, let me address 16 myself to you, Mr. Caruso.

MR. CARUSO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I have got a bit of a beef with the letter you sent me dated September 26 and I want to maybe set out some parameters for going forward. That letter asked, in seemingly innocuous language, for the Court to extend all existing deadlines in the two matters to October 16, 2024, and framed it as a matter of collegiality, professional courtesy among What it omitted to disclose was the fact that, as I have now come to understand the letter, you are not just asking

for an extension but you are asking for relief not from the plaintiff but from a Court order, a Court order that certain filings were already due and the deadline already expired. I will entertain that request but it is my expectation from you going forward, and from plaintiff for that matter, that you be more forthright with the Court in that if you are in fact seeking relief from a deadline that has already expired that was set by the Court, you let me know that.

MR. CARUSO: No, your Honor, you are absolutely right and I will do that and I am sorry if you have a beef with it but -- you're right. I am seeking relief from a Court order but you know what? I didn't really think of it that way so I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Well, think of it that way. Mr. Nathan, I am assuming that you will think of it that way. When there are deadlines that I so order and that have my signature, you don't just need to get consent from the other side, you need to ask me for consent. And, when you are asking for it, you need to let me know that it is not just a matter of professional courtesy, that you are asking for relief from the Court with respect to an order.

MR. CARUSO: Your Honor, I take your point completely. Forgive me. I just didn't see it that way when I wrote that letter.

THE COURT: OK. All right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Nathan, let me turn to you first. What would be helpful for me is to understand all of the different matters that I am going to need to decide and what the deadlines are and how they relate to one another, and then we will turn to Mr. Caruso and his request for an extension, but put it all

MR. NATHAN: Certainly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Maybe if you could speak from the podium, and Mr. Caruso, I am going to ask you to do the same when you address the Court. It is a little bit easier for the court reporter.

MR. CARUSO: Of course.

together for me, if you would.

MR. NATHAN: Good afternoon.

The principal enforcement proceeding is the miscellaneous case which is Docket no. 24 Misc. 353. That is a proceeding that was initiated when we registered plaintiffs' judgment in this district. That judgment, as I am sure your Honor is aware, reflects the end of a very lengthy process in the District of Columbia, a jury trial of which my clients were awarded a significant damages number for the defendant's willful defamatory campaign against them that he orchestrated following the 2020 presidential election. That judgment enforcement proceeding is going to be fairly expansive as things stand. One of the issues that will need to be decided and which has -- I won't say they're fully briefed but we filed conference

09R5freC

a motion and the opposition deadline is the one that passed on Monday.

THE COURT: So that is the turnover motion.

MR. NATHAN: That's right, and maybe I should just take the motions in order.

THE COURT: In part what I need to know is what is the relief that you are seeking; what has been briefed, what the deadlines are, how the pieces relate to one another.

MR. NATHAN: Absolutely.

After serving various process on the judgment debtor which included an information subpoena, a restraining notice, registering our judgment here, we filed a motion for turnover on August 30. That motion actually asked for two types of relief under New York execution procedures. It asked for turnover of the personal property that we are aware of from Mr. Giuliani's disclosures in his bankruptcy case which took up the first eight months of this year. It also asks for appointment of receivers over the real property.

THE COURT: That's the New York apartment and Florida property?

MR. NATHAN: To be precise it is actually, in the first instance, only the Florida condominium apartment. Real property is not eligible for turnover under CPLR 5225.

THE COURT: Right. The condo shares are.

MR. NATHAN: But the co-op shares are treated as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

personal property for purposes of New York judgment enforcement procedures. Having said that, personal property is eligible for receivership and if Mr. Giuliani does not comply with the turnover order entered by this Court, we have asked that any property that isn't promptly turned over or delivered to plaintiffs is then included in the receivership after a certain period of time. We have asked for seven days for Mr. Giuliani to execute any documents necessary to deliver that property.

THE COURT: We will, I am sure, get to this after I receive briefing from the other side, but is a receiver really the right remedy for personal property that is not turned over or is it actually arrest of that property by the marshal or the sheriff or law enforcement?

That is a question that we would be happy MR. NATHAN: to address. We have covered it as a preliminary matter in our opening brief in support of the motion. Some types of personal property present the classic case for receivership and in this case one of those would be Mr. Giuliani's intangible claim for unpaid attorneys fees that he testified he was owed for work relating to his representation of one of the presidential campaigns in 2020. There are other types of personal property for which it is sometimes preferred to use the receivership process so that private sale can be effected to maximize the value of that property. Not everything is value maximizable when it is seized by a sheriff and auctioned as a foreclosure

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

09R5freC conference

auction and that is the basic principal that New York courts look to in that type of case, and we will have arguments for why the property that we are discussing here hits those criteria.

THE COURT: So that is the turnover motion that was filed on August 30. Refresh me as to what the deadline was.

MR. NATHAN: The deadline to oppose that motion was September 23rd.

There were then -- and this I hope will end up just being a footnote to all of this -- as part of plaintiff's judgment enforcement efforts, a restraining notice was served on an account held at a bank in Missouri called Parkside Financial Bank & Trust. There is an account there held by an entity known as Giuliani Communications, LLC, with which we have become intimately familiar. That is the entity that Mr. Giuliani characterized as his alter ego in the bankruptcy proceedings. Those funds held in that account are subject to restraint at the moment, but there is a procedure in New York for claiming exemptions of restrained funds if there is a basis for such a claim. A couple weeks ago a representative of Mr. Giuliani's hand-delivered exemption claims to, actually, to the offices of Willkie Farr in New York City, and we had no choice but to file motions to quash those claims of exemption. We filed those motions, I believe, on September -- well, I know the deadline. The deadline is October 1 to respond to our

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

09R5freC conference

For reasons I am happy to explain, I don't think that there is a serious case for either claim of exemption as things stand but they do stand with very different footing just based on the details of the claims and the funds that are the subject of the claims. I can get into that if your Honor is interested, although the reality is it may be more constructive for me to discuss those issues with Mr. Caruso first. not something we have had a chance to do since he was retained in this case. And I'm sorry I didn't mention, the deadline for opposition to those motions is October 1. That is calculated based on local rules, your Honor has not entered orders with respect to those motions.

Last, but certainly not least, is the civil action that we filed also on August 30.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, before we get to the civil action --

MR. NATHAN: Please.

THE COURT: -- do the two motions that you mentioned that take care of the miscellaneous matter resolve the miscellaneous matter?

MR. NATHAN: I wish I could say so. The miscellaneous matter, it is the docket on which we plan to file all necessary process and all necessary motions to investigate and then enforce against Mr. Giuliani's assets that are within the jurisdiction of this Court.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So am I understanding you correctly that what you are hoping to do is get a response to the information subpoena and then continue your investigation, then if there are further turnover motions to make those, is that where you are going?

MR. NATHAN: If I could add a little bit of color? I would say that our hope of receiving a response to the information subpoena, "hope" is maybe a strong word. We have been through this before with Mr. Giuliani. In fact, it began in the underlying litigation in the District of Columbia where, ultimately, default judgment was entered as to liability because Mr. Giuliani refused to respond to valid discovery requests or comply with Court orders ordering him to comply with those requests. That related both to his own individual financial information. There was an adverse inference ordered against Mr. Giuliani at trial based on his failure to disclose his own personal financial information and the jury was instructed to infer that he did that for the purpose of concealing and minimizing the assets that the jury would know about, at trial. He also did the same with respect to his controlled entities. Then there was a bankruptcy and exactly the same thing repeated itself. That bankruptcy case was thrown out, essentially, for the same reason.

We are now in judgment enforcement proceedings where plaintiffs have a lot of freedom under execution procedures to

conference

seek discovery, not just from the judgment debtor but from many third-parties who may be in possession of relevant information, and that is what we are doing now. But I would say our optimism of receiving that information from Mr. Giuliani is measured, at best. We may be more successful and we have been up to this point, with some third-party discovery. The reality here is that my clients have been waiting a long time for compensation and at this point they're doing everything they can to get it but we are up against a lot of resistance.

THE COURT: Maybe to cut to the chase in the miscellaneous matter, it is not just the information subpoena but it may be other subpoenas and other justification ultimately leading either to expansion, if I authorize a receiver to the receiver's authority, or additional turnover motions.

MR. NATHAN: I think that's a fair prediction. I will say the property that we know about is the property we have already characterized -- I shouldn't be so absolute. We have tried to cover a significant portion of the property we know about in the turnover motion that's already been filed but that is just based on Mr. Giuliani's disclosures in the bankruptcy case which we also know we are not complete or always perfectly accurate, so there may be other stuff that would get rolled into that. There may also be property held by third-parties where a receivership, potentially, would be unnecessary because

the third-parties in many cases we expect, will just comply to the turnover.

THE COURT: They would be garnishees subject to civil action.

MR. NATHAN: The civil action filed also on August 30, that is the action, Docket no. 24 Civ. 6563. That is a declaratory judgment action seeking to confirm plaintiffs' rights against the Florida condominium apartment.

The backstory here is that there was a moment in the bankruptcy where Mr. Giuliani, as late as I think as July 9, had asked to liquidate all of his non-exempt assets, he essentially asked to convert from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7.

That is not what ended up happening but at that moment the plan was that everything that wasn't exempt would be sold. Then Mr. Giuliani seems to have hatched a new plan which was, on July 15, he executed an affidavit in New Hampshire that said I live in Florida now. I am summing up but that's the gist of it. Mr. Giuliani also publicly broadcasts his location on a regular basis and that complaint alleges that, on virtually every day and on every day that we are aware of, his location since Mr. Giuliani changed his mind or purported to change his mind about where he lives he was actually in New Hampshire, in Europe, in Chicago, in Dallas, anywhere but Palm Beach.

THE COURT: So in the civil action what remains is the date for a responsive pleading; is that right?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NATHAN: Yes.

And then a case management plan. THE COURT:

MR. NATHAN: I don't know if this will come as good news or bad news but our plan is for things to proceed a little differently than that. This is also not something that I had an opportunity to discuss with Mr. Caruso, it was on the agenda before the letters materialized yesterday, but as things stand, it is plaintiffs' position that based on the publicly available evidence, we are entitled to judgment as a matter of law and we intend to file a summary judgment motion not later than Wednesday of next week seeking summary judgment. Mr. Giuliani wants to contest summary judgment or thinks that there is evidence that could create a material dispute, all that evidence is in his possession, he can disclose it all and we can have a very expedited hearing on the merits. But, until he does that, it is our position that because the Court in this case where he has been publicly broadcasting his location since he made this claim of residence in Florida, there is really nothing -- summary judgment is appropriate now.

THE COURT: So, two follow-up questions and I apologize for interrupting you, but it appears to me that to the extent in the miscellaneous matter you are seeking a receiver for the Florida property, I can't resolve that until I resolve your request for a declaratory judgment in the civil action number. Am I correct about that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NATHAN: I'm not sure that that's quite right only because I think, and this is why we filed -- this is why we filed the declaratory judgment action. We wanted to put this in issue and make sure that this issue was presented and decided conclusively because we weren't sure what defenses Mr. Giuliani might raise to the turnover or receivership motion. Frankly we weren't sure that he would appear and oppose it and we didn't want to be in a position where we were stuck litigating about these issues without an opponent and without a basis for this Court to enter a real judgment that would have preclusive effect going forward. I am not really in a position to say or take a position on whether you could take the step of just appointing receivers over the property. might be a question of whether the receivers have power to sell without further procedure related to the homestead exemption. Either way, we have tried to clean that up by filing the declaratory judgment action.

THE COURT: So, by your calculation, when is the responsive pleading due in the civil action?

MR. NATHAN: The responsive pleading is due Wednesday, October 2. That is also the date we plan to file the summary judgment motion.

THE COURT: And then the response to summary judgment motion, according to the Court rules, would be the 16th.

MR. NATHAN: Would be 14 days which would be the 16th.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14

I would say this is not somewhere that -- we just didn't get this far with Mr. Caruso when we were discussing scheduling matters. Where this was headed, at least as far as our own position was concerned, was that to the extent there is a responsive pleading or a responsive motion, it might make sense to roll that into the briefing on the summary judgment motion that is forthcoming. But the key, from our perspective, is that there is really -- the civil action is something that can be decided really quickly. What is at issue, from our perspective, is whether Mr. Giuliani established actual residency in the Palm Beach condo during the relevant period. The public record indicates that he was not there at all. to say that we would even have to prove that much. But I think anybody in this courtroom could figure out where they were physically for the last 90 days, more or less off the top of their head. It is not an evidentiary-complicated issue that needs to be decided. We think discovery, if discovery were necessary, could be lightning fast and we could be ready for a merits hearing on that question. Again, that is assuming that there is even evidence that Mr. Giuliani can come forward with to resist summary judgment in the first place.

THE COURT: So are there any other motions or deadlines?

MR. NATHAN: No.

THE COURT: OK. If the summary judgment response is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not going to be due until October 16, and even if, as you

suggested, that date might also be the date for the responsive pleading in the civil action number, is there any reason why I wouldn't set a uniform date of October 16 for everything that we have discussed so far, maybe leaving aside the motion to quash?

MR. NATHAN: Yes, your Honor. And I am sorry to be a stick in the mud on this, but our clients have been around the block with Mr. Giuliani quite a lot. We filed a turnover motion because -- and maybe I should explain. The background for the need for speed in this case, as things stand right now, again, this was subject to ongoing discussion at the time Mr. Caruso filed the letter and hasn't continued since but there is no reason it couldn't resume; there are three reasons why we need to move as quickly as we possibly can and can't do piecemeal extensions on every little thing, certainly not without objection.

The first and probably most important is that the dismissal of Mr. Giuliani's bankruptcy case came with a one-year bar on refiling. That dismissal was entered August 2, 2024. We started up in this court on August 5 and we have been pushing since then. Mr. Caruso only appeared, it is true, a couple weeks ago, but Mr. Giuliani could have hired counsel at any time before that. He has got counsel in many other matters and, for that matter, he has got the same counsel on his appeal

for the final judgment in D.C. is appearing in this case.

We only have a year, and at this point only 10 months, from our perspective, before Mr. Giuliani files a new bankruptcy case to throw another wrench in my clients' efforts to get compensation and accountability. So we are just not willing to slow things. Two months have gone by already and we are not really willing to slow anything down any more than it absolutely has to be. That is not to say we haven't and won't extend professional courtesies when they are necessary. But, we offered a deadline of October 7 for the turnover and receivership motion. That offer, we didn't get a response, we got this letter instead. So we think we are extending professional courtesies where they are appropriate.

THE COURT: Putting aside the questions of professional courtesy, I'm not accusing anybody of being professionally incourteous [sic]. So, was there another reason?

MR. NATHAN: I apologize. There is two more.

Another, which it is in our papers but is probably important.

THE COURT: It is not professionally incourteous [sic]. I probably should have said discourteous, but go ahead.

MR. NATHAN: In our papers we pointed this out but just so it is also in the back of everyone's mind, the two principal assets available to Mr. Giuliani's creditors are the

two apartments. Each of them comes with pretty hefty monthly maintenance fees. I think it's about \$15,000 in New York and about \$10,000 in Florida. That just means that every month that goes by Mr. Giuliani -- and the bankruptcy established I would say a pattern -- at best he was uneven about making sure the maintenance got paid and as far as we know when we get to those apartments, they may come with pretty substantial obligations to the co-op or to the condominium association, respectively, that the creditors will be left holding the bag with. That is another reason that we need to move as quickly as we can.

And then the third is, as I have been discussing this afternoon, we have been here before. There is a pattern that we are now familiar with of Mr. Giuliani asking for more time, then coming forward, if he comes forward with anything at all, with something that is just patently insufficient. Then that needs to be addressed either through motion practice or otherwise. And the reality is at this point, after years of litigation and eight months of bankruptcy, the amount of complete responsive productions we have ever received from Mr. Giuliani about anything is probably, could be summarized — the number of documents might shock how little we have ever ultimately gotten.

Now, having said all of that, that is a problem we have to live with but it also means that my clients are just --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

09R5freC conference

1 we are not going to agree to extensions that take us nowhere.

THE COURT: I understand the points that you are The question that is on my mind has to do with the making. Florida property which is a portion of the request that you have made in the miscellaneous matter and whether it is sensible to have Mr. Caruso respond on the 7th, let's say, to that, or an earlier date to that with respect to the Florida property when his response with respect to the Florida property in the civil action is not going to be due until later.

MR. NATHAN: That I understand and I would say that if your Honor is of the view that the questions relating to the Florida property, including whether the Florida property is eligible for receivership for this reason having to do with the homestead exemption should be decided together, I think what I would suggest, at least from plaintiffs' point of view, is that may be the case but then it would still not be a reason not to decide the other matters raised in the turnover motion and receivership motion on the current schedule.

> Is there anything else, Mr. Nathan? THE COURT:

MR. NATHAN: I think your Honor had asked us to --

THE COURT: The information subpoena.

MR. NATHAN: Oh, there is the information subpoena. think we will just have to understand from Mr. Caruso what Mr. Giuliani's plan is with respect to that subpoena. to say we are not -- I don't know what kind of assurances we

could accept at this point that a response that is sufficient will be forthcoming so we may just need to address that in due course.

THE COURT: I gather through a motion to compel at some point.

MR. NATHAN: Yes. So, maybe to be continued on that one. The other issue that was raised in your Honor's order was the question of consolidation under Rule 42 and I am happy to address that.

THE COURT: Why don't you address it now.

MR. NATHAN: The short answer is we have no objection. I think it sounds as if we are on the same page. To the extent that there is significant overlap between the two matters it is not perfect and, as I laid out, the miscellaneous action will end up encompassing a lot more than what is at issue in the civil action. But, that said, if it is administratively convenient to the Court to consolidate them, we would have no objection, with the understanding that consolidation doesn't affect the separateness of the cases for purposes of appeals from final decisions in either of the cases.

THE COURT: What I am inclined to do, and then I will hear from Mr. Caruso, is for now hold off on consolidation but continue to hold hearings in both matters at the same time with the transcript to be filed in both matters. But, I will hear from Mr. Caruso.

24

25

20

Mr. Caruso, I have a couple of questions for you and 1 then I will hear from you on the deadlines. 2 3 MR. CARUSO: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: The first question, I am now looking at 5 the turnover order, the various items of property and your 6 letter talks about the apartments, but with respect to the 7 other items of personal property, just to streamline things, is there anything that you are able to tell me today that 8 9 Mr. Giuliani is going to turn over? Can we go through this and 10 say he is going to turn over the items of furniture, 11 television, I can sign an order to that effect? 12 MR. CARUSO: Your Honor, I can't commit to that today. 13 I haven't even read these papers until today and I haven't 14 spoken to the client. I need some time to get this case 15 organized. And I am sure -- I am sure -- that there are going to be items where I will come in and say there is no defense 16 17 and we can give it to receiver. But, for example, for 18 example --THE COURT: I heard you say that you are not going to 19 20 be able to today help me streamline this. Tell me why it is 21 that you should get any extension, and if you get any 22 extension, why it should be beyond October 7.

MR. CARUSO: Because I need a little more time than that to get everything in this case organized.

THE COURT: I mean, turnover motions are not terribly

09R5freC conference complicated in a case where -- how long have you been 1 representing your client? 2 3 MR. CARUSO: I appeared a week ago. 4 THE COURT: I know how long ago you appeared in this 5 How long have you been representing him? case. 6 MR. CARUSO: On an appeal? Since -- I think it was 7 May? April? March? THE COURT: Judgment collection is not something that 8 9 has been alien to Mr. Giuliani, but go ahead. Tell me why you 10 are going to need a lot of time to address the question of 11 turnover of the Mercedes Benz, the furniture, the television, 12 the sports memorabilia, the Reggie Jackson picture, the Joe 13 DiMaggio shirt, the rings. 14 MR. CARUSO: Because, for example, with respect to 15 property that is unique, of course it can be monetized -priced and monetized, but it also might make sense to put that 16 17 property into the hands of a receiver so it is out of the 18 defendant's hands but not sold yet pending an appeal. 19 THE COURT: No, no. Pending an appeal you would have 20 to bond it. You are not bonded. 21 MR. CARUSO: But, Judge, you don't have to bond it. 22 There are plenty of cases under CPLR 5240 that say that a Court

dealt with some of them in the Ramen-Ya case that I had. So

In fact, I

THE COURT: I'm aware of those cases.

has discretion to refrain from --

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you will brief them to me but you may have a little bit of an uphill battle in saying that those cases, which really talk about protecting somebody's ability to live day-by-day, apply to World Series rings. I am sure Mr. Giuliani can live without his World Series rings. MR. CARUSO: Your Honor, I just want to make another point.

THE COURT: Can he?

MR. CARUSO: Excuse me?

THE COURT: Can he live without his World Series rings?

MR. CARUSO: I suppose so. Who can't?

THE COURT: OK.

MR. CARUSO: I want to make another point because Mr. Nathan said -- this is from his clients -- this is the end of a long process. No, it isn't. No, it isn't. I am filing an appellate brief on Wednesday. They have a lot to answer for. OK? There is a lot more ahead.

THE COURT: No, I understand that but you are not bonded, are you?

MR. CARUSO: No, because what bonding company is going to bond a ridiculous amount of \$140 million? No bonding company is going to do that. We have to do this on our own and that's exactly what we are doing.

THE COURT: You are speaking to the wrong Court with

1 respect to that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARUSO: Yes, I understand that. Although, 5240 does use the word "stay" in some of the cases.

THE COURT: I am aware of 5240.

MR. CARUSO: Look, your Honor. Please. It seems to me you have three things. You have an answer to a complaint, a case that was originally filed in front of Judge Hellerstein. I have got the response to a motion for turnover which involves substantive law including Florida homestead law and the law of domicile. I will come back to that. And point three, I have got this subpoena, the information subpoena. The briefing in opposition to the turnover motion is going to call for some research and writing because the law of domicile is not what Mr. Nathan says. He said there has to be an actual residency. No, it doesn't. That is not right. A person can change his domicile instantaneously. It requires the existence of a residence, which Mr. Giuliani has, and a state of mind to make that new place your permanent home. That is a fact question. A fact question. He points to 47 days in which I think the numbers are, 34 of them Mr. Giuliani was out of Florida. Yes, on business. He was at the DNC and the RNC. Being away from your home for business doesn't go against your claim of domicile. 47 days is a pathetically short period of time within which to measure domicile. It can be changed instantaneously and it doesn't require actual presence or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

24

conference

actual residence. Look at members of the armed forces. don't lose their domicile when they go abroad. Members of big law firms get assigned to the European office, they don't lose their American domicile. It has to do with the state of mind. Which brings me to the next point about a summary judgment motion. This is not a word I throw around very -- I'm not going to throw it around. Surely there is a question of fact. State of mind. Domicile turns on that. If he doesn't want to do discovery, that is fine, but summary judgment? That, to me, sounds ridiculous. And summary judgment before I answer? That's even more ridiculous. Right? Let's -- I would like two more weeks. It is not asking a lot. I am new to this case --THE COURT: Let me ask you this question. You heard

my question to Mr. Nathan about the overlapping in the matters and I now hear you talking about the overlap in the matters a little bit but what is your view on that with respect to the Florida property, request for the turnover.

MR. CARUSO: Your Honor anticipated the point that I was going to make. I don't see how you can possibly rule on a turnover in the miscellaneous case while the whole question of domicile and homestead exemption is at issue in the civil action.

THE COURT: So why can't you, in your response on the miscellaneous matter with respect to the Florida property, address the question that I addressed to Mr. Nathan?

Mr. Nathan said he was not sure whether I would have to decide the declaratory judgment matter before a receiver was appointed. I hear you now arguing you have to -- you, Judge -- have to decide whether the Florida property is Mr. Giuliani's homestead before you put it in the hands of a receiver. I understand the arguments both ways but it strikes me that you could address that law, and then later on addressing for me whatever arguments you have got that the Florida property is his homestead.

MR. CARUSO: I understand, your Honor, and I am not sure where you are going --

THE COURT: Where I am going is whether what I should do is require you, in the miscellaneous matter, to respond on October 7 to the turnover motion which is substantial extension, a very substantial extension from the date that I have set. Basically it is a two-week extension from the date that I set and gives you four weeks from the date that it was served, and let's leave aside the restraining notice for a second, and then have you respond on the 16th in the civil action with an answer and an opposition to the motion for summary judgment, if you are intending to oppose it.

Why isn't that generous?

MR. CARUSO: Now I see where your Honor is going. How about Friday, the 11th for the turnover, and I ask that because my one and only associate will be out for Rosh Hashanah up to

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

October 7. I just don't think it is asking a lot, your Honor.

October is not far away. Your proposal regarding October 16

for the civil action with an answer and an opposition to the

motion for summary judgment is fine. That is fine. That is

what I asked for. Can I have a little more than the 7th? I

have a major filing due on Monday in state court. I have got a

brief in this very case due on Wednesday.

THE COURT: When are you going to respond to the motion to quash? And really, frankly, do you have any opposition to the motion to quash?

MR. CARUSO: Oh, the motion to quash. Sorry. I misunderstood. To me, that should be the least of our concerns because the money is frozen. The bank is holding it. It is out of Mr. Giuliani's hands. Now, it is not in their hands, of course, but it is out of Mr. Giuliani's hands.

THE COURT: The effect of an exemption is that you are exempt from the restraining notice; isn't that right,

Mr. Nathan?

MR. NATHAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So if you are telling me that you are going to withdraw the exemption request then that makes life easy, then you don't have to respond so here is what I have in mind: You will respond on October 1 to the motion to quash.

Taking into account Rosh Hoshanah, you will respond on October 8 to the motion to enforce. And on the 16th, you will

responsive pleading.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respond to the motion for summary judgment and you will file a

MR. CARUSO: May I just look at my book for a moment?

2.7

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

MR. CARUSO: Again, please, your Honor, considering what else I am doing, especially in this case between Monday and Wednesday of next week, can we make that October 1st date the 4th? It is three days and it makes a big difference to me and the quality of my work.

THE COURT: No. It's pretty simple. You can do it on October 1st. You have got a weekend, you can work on it.

MR. CARUSO: I have got a weekend to work on my appellate brief.

THE COURT: One other matter. I am wondering if I should have you in shortly after October 16 to talk about future dates in this case. Among other things, I want to move on a quick basis so if it looks like you are going to be filing a Rule 56(d) application with your motion for summary judgment, it may be that we should at least have some provisional dates on the calendar for discovery and for what I presume, under homestead, would be Mr. Giuliani's deposition and deposition of others.

MR. CARUSO: That's what I would expect.

THE COURT: So, I assume he is keeping himself -- he will be available for deposition in late October and early

09R5freC

November.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARUSO: Let's fix a date and I will make sure he is available.

> THE COURT: OK.

MR. CARUSO: I agree with you, your Honor. After the 16th let's have a conference and fix these dates, and maybe between now and then counsel can come up with some suggestions.

THE COURT: And frankly, it may be that we don't need discovery. I am not prejudging the issue of discovery. What I want to avoid is the circumstance where the motion is fully briefed and then I decide that there is a question of fact and it turns out that you are going to come to me and say, well, you know, Mr. Giuliani is a busy man and he can't make himself available for deposition and where the plaintiff can't get the documents that they want so that's what I am trying to avoid.

MR. CARUSO: I will try to avoid that as well. Mr. Nathan is talking about a pattern of conduct. I wasn't part of that.

THE COURT: I'm not going to make a judgment with respect to that. What I do have in front of me right now is something of a deadline and the need for this case to go quickly. Judgment enforcement actions are not supposed to be extended, lengthy proceedings. The plaintiffs have their judgment. Your client owes them money. Your client has an obligation, imposed by law, imposed by a Court, to satisfy that

29

judgment. Your client has to turn over to them all of the 1 assets that he has in order to satisfy that judgment, except to 2 3 the extent those assets are exempt. That should move quickly. 4 Mr. Nathan, do you have a view -- you can answer 5 without going to the podium -- about how I manage things so 6 that the case is not delayed if there is a need for discovery? 7 MR. NATHAN: Your Honor's suggestion makes perfect sense to us. I think scheduling a date for a conference 8 9 following any opposition that is filed to the motion for 10 summary judgment would be useful and the time frame that you 11 sketched out sounds right to us. As we said before, if there 12 is a question of fact, the relevant evidence is all going to be 13 in the defendant's possession and it will not or should not be 14 complicated to produce and then sit for deposition. THE COURT: OK. Matt, let's come up with a date. 15 MR. CARUSO: Your Honor, can we go through the dates 16 17 again for avoidance of doubt? 18 THE COURT: No. You will have them on a piece of 19 paper that I will issue so it will be abundantly clear from an 20 order that I will issue. 21 MR. CARUSO: Can I take one more run at this? 22 date of the 8th, can you move that to Friday the 11th, please? 23 THE COURT: No. You asked for that and I ruled. 24 We need a date after October 16.

(Court and Deputy Clerk confer)

25

	09R5freC conference
1	THE COURT: How is October 17 at 10:00 am?
2	MR. NATHAN: Unfortunately the holidays are all in the
3	middle of the week this year. The 17th and 18th I am
4	unfortunately unavailable, and the same goes for the 24th and
5	the 25th, but Monday through Wednesday of each of those weeks.
6	Having said that, if that's
7	THE COURT: Mr. Nathan, is there somebody else that
8	can cover? I have an obligation the beginning of the following
9	week and I don't want to do it too close to when I receive the
10	papers. The 17th and 18th you are out. How is the 16th?
11	MR. NATHAN: I am available on the 16th.
12	THE COURT: Late in the day the 16th? Does that work
13	for you, Mr. Caruso?
14	MR. CARUSO: For another conference, your Honor?
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. CARUSO: Yes. That's fine.
17	(Court and Deputy Clerk confer)
18	THE COURT: I think we are going to have to keep it as
19	the 17th at 10:00. Does that work, Mr. Caruso?
20	MR. CARUSO: Yes, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Nathan, you have a big firm. I am
22	sure somebody else can cover for you.
23	MR. NATHAN: We will be OK.

THE COURT: Anything else from plaintiff?

MR. NATHAN: No, your Honor.

```
O9R5freC
                                 conference
               THE COURT: Mr. Caruso, anything?
1
               MR. CARUSO: Nothing, sir.
 2
3
               THE COURT: Have a good weekend, everybody. Thank
 4
      you.
 5
                                      000
6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```